

The time for the recess having expired the City Council meeting reconvened on Monday, February 23, 2015 at 5:39 PM in the Henrietta Attles Meeting Room, 459 Broadway.

PRESIDING OFFICER Mayor David P. Maher

PRESENT Mayor Maher, Vice Mayor Benzan, Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Kelley, Mazen, McGovern, Simmons and Toomey

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Maher stated that Councillor Mazen has requested suspension of the rules to allow the public to speak on a late Policy Order.

The question now came on suspension of the rules – the rules were not suspended due to the lack of the required six votes.

Jason Pramas, 375A Harvard Street, Assistant Professor of Communications, Lesley University, spoke in favor of the policy regarding support of adjunct faculty. He stated that he stood before the City Council last year and asked for support for the adjunct union drive at Lesley. He stated that the City Council offered overwhelming support and Lesley adjuncts went on to win a landslide victory in the union election that took place shortly thereafter. He stated that he is speaking to what Lesley University calls “core faculty.” He stated that this sounds nice but it is not. He stated that there is no tenure at Lesley University. He stated that core faculty at Lesley are all either half-time or full-time contract faculty. He stated that that core faculty is contingent faculty just like adjuncts and that is the reason they are now trying to unionize. He stated that he was brought on as a core faculty member for this academic year earning \$32,000 plus benefits, an office and a title that gives him traditional faculty rank. He stated that this is not a one-way ticket to secure employment. He noted that next year it is virtually certain that he will be an adjunct again since he is considered an “emergency hire” this year. He stated that next year he will teach some of the same courses and he will do so for no more than \$3,500 a course. He stated that this situation is simply part of a structural problem at Lesley and throughout the higher education industry. He asked for support for the Lesley faculty union resolution.

Sara Slavick, 87 Brookside Avenue, Jamaica Plain, stated her support for the resolution in support of the faculty union organizing and bargaining at Lesley University. She stated that for fifteen years she has been an adjunct professor in the Fine Arts Department of Lesley University’s College of Art and Design. She stated that adjunct professors are 48% of the faculty at Lesley University. She stated that they have had little to no say on the trajectory of the curriculum. She stated that adjuncts have to fight for their job every four months and they do not know if they will be teaching until the last minute. She stated that some of the adjunct are living below the poverty line. She stated that her credentials match, and in many cases even surpass, those of her full-time colleagues and she does not get retirement, health benefits and little faculty development support. She stated that the adjunct is operating in the same continuum of labor struggles in history. She stated that Lesley University adjuncts have formed a union

and are negotiating their first contract. They unionized to take action with a collective vision to achieve meaningful change. She asked for City Council support.

Bjorn Poonen, 303 Third Street, stated that he is in support of Policy Order #29 regarding Volpe Park. He stated shrinking the park would reduce the viability of such a park. He stated that it would be best to have a part at the southeast and the northwest so there would be a line of parks.

Nancy Ryan, 4 Ashburton Place, stated her support of Policy Order #29. She stated that they want to preserve the 7.5 acres that was promised throughout the planning and development of Kendall Square. She stated that one of the phrases they have been hearing is “publicly beneficial open space.” She stated that before any more draft zoning is submitted to the Planning Board a meeting should take place with the Area 4 Port Coalition, the East Cambridge Planning Team and the Association of East Cambridge.

Hasson Rashid, 820 Massachusetts Avenue, stated that he is concerned about affordable housing for the chronic adult homeless population and its mosaic. He stated that recent studies and reports point to the urgency of this growing segment of the municipality. He stated that there are actual federal mandates stating that vacant city-owned properties and facilities should be used for the purpose of easing or eradicating homelessness. He urged the City Council not to resort to allowing one of its lower priorities to circumvent the urgent need to convert the Foundry Building into housing. He stated that this building can be reconstructed or redeveloped into a new public facility to accommodate the urgent need for public facilities and human services for the chronic homeless.

James Williamson, 1000 Jackson Place, commented on the banners for JFK Street and the allocation of \$60,000 from free cash for ten sofas. He was informed that they were acted upon on February 20, 2015. He commented that the items were listed as being on the agenda. He was disappointed that these items were acted up without public comment. He commented on the Policy Orders relating to Vail Court and inclusionary zoning. He stated that Vail Court should have been condemned years ago. He asked if this could be done in conjunction with the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority. He wanted clarification of what the current powers of the City are regarding this property. He stated that the Policy Order reads the positive on the inclusionary zoning and he felt it should be looked at in a more neutral way because the experience has not been positive for all. He stated that inclusionary zoning as the only way to get affordable housing needs to be interrogated. The City needs to think of other ways to obtain affordable housing that is not associated with development.

NON CONSENT POLICY ORDERS

3 Here insert Policy Order # 3 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen asked if language could be added to do research on the use of public buildings plan and emergency need. He stated that Canadian cities use city halls for emergency shelters. He asked what other City space could be used for the homeless population.

Councillor Simmons understood the need for homeless housing. She stated that there is a housing crisis for women and families and this Policy Order does not address this population. She wanted to see women and women with families addressed for housing. She stated that homeless heads of households with families end up outside of Cambridge.

Councillor McGovern agreed with Councillor Simmons on housing crisis for women and families. This was an emergency need due to shelter closings. Placement outside of the City disrupts school for children and family connections with Cambridge. He stated that the shelters in Cambridge are not conducive to women and families. This Policy Order was geared to what can be done now with the shelters closing. Councillor Simmons stated that a modification to the Policy Order could be to add with a view toward looking at the homeless housing for women and families.

Councillor McGovern explained that during the recent snow storms the War Memorial was opened as an emergency shelter. It was described by the City as a shelter if there was a problem with the utilities. It was unclear that the shelter was for the homeless population. He stated that the focus is moving away from homeless shelter and more toward transitional housing.

The amendment offered by Councillor Simmons was to add a new paragraph which reads as follows:

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to review the homeless situation for women and families.

The question now came on the amendment – and on a voice vote the amendment – Carried.

The question now came on adoption of the order as amended, which reads as follows:
(HERE COPY AMENDED ORDER #3)

The order was –

Adopted as amended by the affirmative vote of nine members.

4 Here insert Policy Order # 4 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor McGovern noted that there are many issues that are regional issues. Communities do not talk to each other in a formal way and yet communities struggle with many of the same issues. The Policy Order suggests that elected officials meet and discuss the regional issues with a shared vision to lobby for the issues. He wanted an intercity committee to be formed to discuss issues to see how communities could work more effectively together.

Councillor Mazen noted that this effort needs consistent work and may require more than three meetings a year. He wanted to know what this infrastructure would look like and he did not want to limit the number of meetings held.

Councillor McGovern stated that this could evolve, but he wanted to get something that was workable and then build on it. He stated that it seemed to be a reasonable number of times to meet. This is achievable where meeting monthly may not be.

Councillor Cheung stated that he held the first meeting between the Boston and Cambridge City Council and that there are benefits for having dialogue beyond the initial dialogue. He stated that it was a good thing to talk to other communities, even unofficially.

Councillor Simmons stated that her concern was whether this would be permanent and that mayors change every two years and may not have the leadership to keep this going. She asked if this is currently happening. She did not want to replicate what may already exists which could be more robust with more participation or that something is not going to be started that will not continue with the changing of the mayors. She wondered if the MMA has a model for this.

Councillor Carlone stated that there is an intelligent need for this because typically businesses are at the city limits. He stated that the Metropolitan Area Planning Council may welcome something like this. They bring communities together to talk about issues.

Mayor Maher stated that there are different areas of regionalization. Recently there has been more collegiality in looking at this issue. Mayor Maher stated that he and the City Manager would look into this and report back to the City Council. There are complexities with the different governances. Councillor McGovern stated that the communities in the Policy Order were communities that share state representatives. This is about getting conversation between communities started.

Mayor Maher moved to amend the order to add that the City Manager and the Mayor report back to the City Council.

The motion to amend -
Carried on a voice vote.

Councillor McGovern made a motion to amend the order to add "Watertown" after "Somerville" in the first paragraph

The motion to amend -
Carried on a voice vote.

The question now came on adoption of the order as amended, which reads as follows:
(HERE COPY AMENDED POLICY ORDER #4)

The order was -
Adopted as amended by the affirmative vote of nine members.

7 Here insert Policy Order # 7 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen stated that he has not vested interest in the property, but he does know the owners of the property. He has been working to broker meetings with the City Manager and the property owners. He explained that the property owner wants to emerge from litigation and to building something. They have built 40B housing in Lynn. He does not know the history of the circumstances. He is hoping to send this to committee for a discussion or wait until the meeting with the City Manager has transpired before proceeding.

Councillor McGovern was glad that there was conversation with the younger generation of the owners of the property and that there is some movement. He commented that there is no excuse about not cleaning the property. This property has been a blight to the community for years. There is a responsibility to the neighborhood to keep the property clean. He hopes this gets the attention of the property owner.

Councillor Toomey commented that the time for waiting is over. There was a Public Safety meeting and Vail Court was a topic of discussion. He stated that there has been no action by the property owner for years to take care of this property. It is a public safety issue. There is flammable gas next to the property. The building is not secure and the homeless seek access. He stated that the City should demolish the building and give the bill to the property owner. The time for talking is over. This is a blight, nuisance and a public safety issue. This property has been vacant for twenty years.

Councillor Simmons spoke about the City Council's interest in something being done about this property. She agreed with the comments made by Councillor Toomey. She stated that this property sitting vacant with 3,000 Cambridge residents on the housing list is egregious. She told Councillor Mazen that if he has a relationship with the property owner let them know that the message from the City Council is take care of your property or the City will take steps to take the property by eminent domain.

Vice Mayor Benzan stated that this property is active, there are parking spaces that are rented which generates income. The parking spaces have been plowed. There is no reason why graffiti cannot be removed from the front of the property. The City Council is intent on pursuing every avenue to take the property by eminent domain. He stated that it is unfair to the neighbors who have been living with this blighted property in their neighborhood. It is also unfair to those residents who need affordable housing.

Councillor Cheung stated that this property has been an issue every term he has been on the City Council. He noted that in this country the rule of law reigns supreme but makes things move slower. He stated that the City Manager has had limited power to begin the eminent domain process. He encouraged Councillor Mazen to tell his friends to tell the parents that his reputation is on the line. He stated that the residents are fed up.

Councillor Mazen agreed with the comments by his colleagues. This property required cleanup for years. He suspected that the property would be renovated. He stated that the City Manager wanted this lot cleaned up. He stated that city employees park in the lot and he has a bus parked in the lot. It is important that items be removed from the lot. He stated that he felt it would be better to have this information conveyed from the City Manager to the recipient in person with an outcome. He noted that the ideal circumstance would be to have the conversation between the City Manager and the property owner and then adopt the Policy Order next week.

Councillor Carlone commented that when a proposed project failed for this property then the property became unsightly and in great disrepair. He stated that he did not know what the City has done formally over the years. He supported the suggestion made by Councillor Mazen and if this does not work he wanted the property taken.

Councillor Toomey commented on the proper role of the City Council. The City Manager is in charge of the public safety of the City; not the City Council. He stated that a good faith effort is much more than removing graffiti. The condition of this property is unacceptable. He stated that he was unaware that this property was being used as a paid parking lot. He wanted to know whether proper permits have been issued for this property. He stated his concern with gasoline near a vacant building that is a fire hazard; this is a tinderbox. He does not understand why the City has not taken legal action on this property. He wanted to know whether the parking was being done legally or illegally. If the property was taken by eminent domain there would be purchasers lined up to buy the property. His major concern is the public safety issue. He questioned an individual councillor negotiating a deal such as this. He stated that this may be outside the role and ethics of the City Council. There seems to be too much assistance for this property owner who has ignored the concerns of the City for years. He wanted the City Manager to take the necessary steps to have the parked cars removed if they are illegally parked. He wanted to see if permits were issued for the storage of gasoline by the License Commission for this property.

Councillor McGovern stated that he supported the order previously adopted to take this property by eminent domain. He stated that the property owner needs to be faced with financial circumstances.

Councillor Simmons supported assessing fines or charges for not cleaning the property. She did not know what the legal ramification of this would be. She asked her colleagues if they had knowledge of whether the City Manager had conversation with the property owner about the eminent domain order.

Mayor Maher stated that it was his belief that the City has had many conversations and legal notifications have been sent to the property owner. He informed the City Council that an attorney explained that the property was held in trust and that the family members were at odds with one another and were trying to work out a settlement.

Councillor Simmons wanted to take the property by eminent domain and move forward. This has gone on too long. She suggested to Councillor Mazen to bring the sentiments of his colleagues to the meeting with the City Manager and the property owner. She stated that she wanted something, in writing within thirty days, of what the property owner's intentions are.

Councillor Mazen addressed a point of personal privilege. He stated that he felt it was his position to connect a recalcitrant owner with the City Manager and broker a resolution whenever possible. He is proud to do this because the property is blighted and unpopular. He is attempting to make this well. He stated that he has personal stake in this matter because he paid to park, legally and now has to find another parking space. He is not happy with the current state of affairs with this property. He is operating transparently and is trying to get this resolved expeditiously. He would like the family to emerge from their own litigation.

Vice Mayor Benzan wanted to add an amendment that as a matter of public safety the Department of Inspectional Services immediately shut down the site. He stated that he knows of employees of law firms in Central Square that rent parking spaces from this property owner. He stated that the time has come for the City to apply pressure to take care of this property. This property could be used for affordable housing.

Councillor Kelley stated that a similar problem exists on Cedar Street in North Cambridge. There is a junky house and the City has gone through efforts to address the condition of the property. He stated that many things can be done regarding these properties but at the end of the day the City must follow certain rules.

Councillor McGovern offered the following amendments:

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to investigate whether the current parking taking place on this property is legally permitted and meets safety standards, and if not to take immediate action to shut down this parking lot

The question now came on the amendment - and on a voice vote the amendment - Carried.

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to notify the owners of Vail Court that they must respond in writing, to the City Manager within thirty days of receiving said notice, with their long term plans for this property or the City will take the property by eminent domain.

No action was taken on the amendment at this time.

Councillor Kelley stated that he does not have faith in this strategy and that the City Council does not understand the eminent domain process. He felt that the language in the second amendment should not be included in the order.

Mayor Maher noted that in January the City Council passed an order that the City Manager investigate the possibility of eminent domain and this remains on the Awaiting Report List.

Councillor Simmons suggested that the language be that action would be taken up to and not limited to eminent domain, or all actions will be taken afforded to the City of Cambridge including eminent domain. She was displeased that the owners were receiving revenue while leaving the property an eyesore.

Mayor Maher suggested that the City Solicitor in conjunction with the City Manager report back to the City Council on any and all possible actions that the City may take against the property owner.

Councillor McGovern stated that he supported the comment by Councillor Simmons that the property owner respond in writing in thirty days. He compared this situation with the Fresh Pond mall owners, who when the City Council got serious, began to work cooperatively with the City. The Vail Court property owners have ignored the will of the neighborhood and the City Council for too long. They are plowing the parking lot so it is assumed that revenue is being received. He submitted language for the amendment as follows:

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to notify the owners of Vail Court that they must respond in writing, to the City Manager within thirty days of receiving said notice, with their long term plans for this property or the City will take legal action including the possibility of taking the property by eminent domain.

The question now came on the amendment - and on a voice vote the amendment - Carried.

The question now came on adoption of the order as amended which reads as follows:
(HERE COPY AMENDED ORDER #7)

Charter Right exercised by Councillor Mazen on the order as amended.

9 Here insert Policy Order # 9 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Cheung commented that this was similar to Order # 4 and he did not want to imply that the City Manager was not working with the City of Somerville, because he is. He did not know if this should be withdrawn because Order # 4 has been passed.

Councillor Mazen did not want to withdraw the order. He wanted this to be collated with Order # 4. He felt that regular meeting are crucial and that this was not covered in Order # 4.

Councillor McGovern stated that he would vote against this Order # 9. Three meetings suggested in Order # 4 is reasonable and Order # 4 has been passed. He did not see the need for Order # 9.

Councillor Kelley agreed with Councillor McGovern on this matter. He reiterated again that the City Council asks the City Manager to do many things and he felt that the City Council should show self-discipline as to what the City Council wants the City Manager and his staff to do.

Councillor Carlone stated that he felt Order # 9 was more relevant than Order # 4. He stated that Somerville is Cambridge's biggest and most intricate neighbor. The future of one affects the future of the other. He stated that he would vote in support of Order # 9.

Councillor Simmons stated Order # 9 is a duplication and requested her colleague to withdraw the Order and addressed the concerns in this order in Order #4. She stated that she would not support this order because they are similar.

Councillor Mazen stated that the main difference in the two orders are the frequency. He did not feel that three months gets the same results as regular meetings. If regionalism is to be taken seriously more work is needed. He does not think that the process will work with just three meetings.

The question came on the adoption of the order and on a voice vote the order -
Failed of Adoption.

#21 Here insert Policy Order # 21 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Carlone stated that he wanted this investigated to find out what the status is.

The question now came on adoption of the order and on a voice vote the order was -
Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

#24 Here insert Policy Order # 24 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen questioned what the incentives might be. He stated that he is in favor of anything that can accelerate the Grand Junction Path. He asked what incentives could be applied that are not part of the planning process. Councillor Toomey responded that in his letter to the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority he stated that he hoped that an overlay district could create a valuable tool. The overlay district would encompass from the Charles River to the Somerville line. It creates a more unified approach. He is hopeful that this will bring MIT to the table because they are the largest single land owner and this overlay will create opportunities for the land owner, the City, the CRA and the residents. Councillor Mazen stated that what he is hearing is that it will create a more unified treatment of the area and the incoming path. Councillor Toomey explained that the cost is the cost and would not be offset. There is going to be a lot of negotiating with the land owners needed.

Councillor Carlone stated that this is brilliant and there could be a combination of a setback line or in lieu of open space in the zones along the corridor that this would count as the improvement commenced to the passageway as open space. He stated that the Community Development could create a series of guidelines that makes it consistent and this becomes part of the zoning. When

developers want to develop land adjacent it will enhance the edge and the certainty of the edge will be known and this helps development.

The question now came on the adoption of the order and the order was -
Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

#25 Here insert Policy Order # 25 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Cheung questioned having a definitive set of recommendations from the STEAM Working Group. He wanted either a clarification or a definitive set of recommendations.

Councillor Mazen stated that the full set of recommendations were presented to the City Manager. Mayor Maher noted that the recommendations are contained in Committee Report #1.

Vice Mayor Benzan stated that this work is important to the residents because of the booming economy. This is a way to address our residents disconnect that are being left out and the innovation economy by creating pathways to areas in and around Kendall Square. He thanked his colleagues and those who participated in the working group, the School Department, the City Administration and the Office of Workforce Development.

Councillor McGovern stated his support for this work.

Councillor Carlone stated that what has impressed him about this committee is that the educators are so excited and thrilled about the work.

Mayor Maher thanked the committee for their work. The enthusiasm and commitment that has been shown over a period of time is that when you look at the emerging Cambridge economy and the importance of science is work that the City is grateful for.

Councillor Simmons commented that this is how committee work should work. To do the work and bring the recommendations back to the City Council.

The question now came on adoption of the order and the order was -
Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

#26 Here insert Policy Order # 26 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen stated that this should be a celebration of the benefits of inclusionary housing but should concern the context of affordable housing in the City's future. He did not inclusionary housing to be the only affordable housing tool. He wanted friendly language added to back off the bias.

Vice Mayor Benzan stated that the word "positive" could be eliminated. He explained that the spirit of the order to is learn more about the inclusionary zoning program from the tenants that have been directly affected. He stated that it has been stated that the inclusionary program has not worked and there has not been enough data collected on this. He stated that according to the tenants living in the inclusionary housing it is a great program. This program has allowed more than 800 families to stay in Cambridge. It is time to gather data to better understand the inclusionary housing program.

Councillor Mazen stated that he would be in favor of striking the word "positive" to eliminate bias. He felt that would will come away from this will the lives that have been touched by inclusionary housing.

Councillor McGovern stated that it has not been said that inclusionary zoning is the only option for affordable housing. All of his colleague understand that this is a multi-function war that needs to be fought. He stated that the positive aspect is that since 1998 822 units of affordable housing have been able to live in the City. In the income security report to live service free in Cambridge it requires an income of \$90,000. He added that the inclusionary program services a single person making a salary of \$34,000-\$72,000. This is still not enough income to live in Cambridge service free. He stated that thousands of people have been helped by inclusionary zoning. There are going to be more positive stories than not. The negative aspect is more around the apartment location than the inclusionary program. He stated that two residents in Area Four did not know about the inclusionary program. He stated that these are the people that this program is designed to help to remain in Cambridge. He stated that there is a possibility that inclusionary program has not been publicized enough. He stated that the dialogue around the City that he has heard about residential development and affordable units and the champions of affordable housing are now saying that twenty affordable units does not mean anything. It matters to the people who will live in these units. There is a need to publicize the positive aspects of this. The City should celebrate this more than it does.

Councillor Simmons stated that Community Development Department works on housing issues. She stated that there are 9,000 people on the Cambridge Housing Authority waiting list that is being frozen. She stated that the Housing Division of Community Development is doing an inclusionary housing study of tenants in these units. She supports the intent of the order but is concerned with the duplicity of the work being done by Community Development. She did not want to add more to Community Development Department at this juncture. She has requested a Roundtable to discuss the Nexus Study with the Affordable Housing Trust, CDD, CHA and community based organizations to address this issue. She requested her colleagues to place this on the table and not make this a priority at this time.

Councillor Cheung agreed with his colleagues that this is a fantastic program. He agreed that this should be placed on the table.

Vice Mayor Benzan stated that this is something that has been in the works and he did confirm with CDD if this was something they wanted to do. It was better that this come from the City Council due to CDD being under attack this past year. The positive work done by CDD have been highlighted including managing the inclusionary zoning program. He stated that if there are 852 units completed or in the pipeline this would have cost the City over \$400 million. This money would not have been raised through linkage fees or any other means. This program is significant and this fact cannot be denied.

Councillor Carlone stated that no one is against 20-40 units of affordable housing. The negative aspect may stem from the size and taking away value from adjacent housing. He noted that a comprehensive approach yields more benefit than a parcel by parcel approach. All the City Council agree that more needs to be done. To do more all the opportunities must be reviewed, including City owned parking lots.

Councillor McGovern stated that this is the reason that the Policy Order was filed to build on City owned land, because something different needs to be done about affordable housing. The dialogue seems to be shifting that inclusionary zoning is not such a great thing.

Mayor Maher explained that the 9,000 people on the waiting list is the Cambridge Housing Authority list. The inclusionary housing list has a 6-9 month wait. He stated that initially there was little movement with this program because few housing units were being built. Movement occurs when there is a good economy. Up until 2008 no units were being added to the inclusionary housing. Now there is a boom with the 850 units. Although it is not accessible to all this housing is meeting the needs of a segment of the population. He stated that the inclusionary housing is not the answer to the housing problem, but it is one of the answers. He explained that the CHA is in a renovation phase and not in a phase to add new properties to their housing stock. He stated that the City needs to look at the issue of housing and how the City can respond. The City cannot meet all the needs for housing and all angles must be discussed. When the idea of inclusionary zoning began it was whether additional density could be absorbed for the benefit of this housing. A determination was made that 15% of the bonus would generate another 15% of units. The density went from 100% to 130%. He commented that this housing is not insignificant. There is no way that the City of Cambridge could have afforded to build \$500 million worth of housing. The City needs to get behind whether there will be additional density or not.

Vice Mayor Benzan commented that in five years Rindge Towers will be a big issue for the preservation of these units. Where will the funding come from to preserve these units?

Councillor Simmons supported the spirit of the order. She exercised her charter right on this order as amended to strike out the word "positive" in the sixth paragraph before the word "impact", which reads as follows:

(HERE INSERT AMENDED ORDER #26)

Charter Right exercised by Councillor Simmons on the order as amended.

#27 Here insert Original Policy Order # 27 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen stated that he was in favor of the Policy Order. He asked whether the renaming should be left to a community process.

Councillor Cheung stated that he did not want to be in a position to rename someone's neighborhood.

Councillor Simmons stated that in 2012 when she was Vice Mayor she submitted this same Policy Order. She agreed that there should be a community process to return the name to the culturally significant name of "The Port." There are new residents in Area Four who have no knowledge of the base or the history of where the name came from. She stated that Area Four was known as "the Port" and Riverside was known as "the Coast." There have been processes in the past which have not gone anywhere. The newer residents want to call the area Area Four and the people who live in the neighborhood want to call it "The Port." The process should be organic. She supported the order. She wanted the order amended to include a community process

Vice Mayor Benzan suggested that on Area 4 Pride Day a vote be taken to rename Area Four.

Councillor Simmons wanted the Fletcher-Maynard School to create a community process culminating on Area Four Pride Day.

Mayor Maher stated that Community Development or Human Services could do more outreach. He stated that the book done by Sarah Boyer on "The Port" will be celebrated.

The question now came on the amendment to strike out the last paragraph and insert in place thereof the following new paragraph:

ORDERED: That the City Manager be and hereby is requested to confer with the appropriate departments and to engage the Fletcher-Maynard School to create a community process that would culminate on Area Four Pride Day for the renaming of Area Four as "The Port" and to report back to the City Council in a timely manner.

The question now came on the amendment and on a voice vote the amendment - Carried.

The question now came on adoption of the order as amended which reads as follows:
(HERE COPY AMENDED ORDER #27)

The order was -

Adopted as amended by the affirmative vote of nine members.

#29 Here insert Policy Order # 29 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor McGovern stated that he wanted to see dramatic open space in this area. He did not know why this is being filed now. When there is a presentation from Volpe this should be before the Ordinance Committee so that questions could be answered about the 7.5 acres of open space.

Councillor Carlone stated that the present zoning states 7.5 acres; the agreement with the neighborhood and the East Cambridge Planning Study was 7.5 acres and what is before the City is a down zoning to 2.5 acres. The Policy Order asks that there be an option to include a discussion on the 7.5 acres. He commented that the City Council does zoning and this has not been discussed by the City Council and the 7.5 acres has been thrown out of the window. He wanted the 7.5 acres to be considered and what is being presented is 1/3 less.

Councillor McGovern questioned the process. He felt it should be discussed in the Ordinance Committee.

Mayor Maher commented that this is a valuable block in the City of Cambridge. He stated that elected officials asked for help from their representatives in Congress to get help with this block. The site is in play now. This can be a great site for the City and the region. He is not against the Policy Order but it is surprising to see it at this juncture. He noted that there will be a Roundtable on April 6, 2015 to discuss the Volpe site. The City Council should wait until the proposal is before the City Council.

Councillor Carlone stated that the amount of open space, whether 2.5 or 7.5, is public policy. He stated that information has been provided that the petitioner wants a smaller park. The neighborhoods have asked to maintain a larger park. He stated that the zoning states 7.5 acres. He stated that making an area livable is the public domain.

Councillor Cheung stated that there were items from the K2 study that he supported and he could submit motions but that would undermine the process. He urged the Chairs of the Ordinance Committee to have a committee meeting on the K2 Study as a whole. He urged that this be discussed at

the meeting. Councillor Carlone stated that a K2 meeting has not been scheduled as of yet due to a backlog. He stated that K2 would be a separate meeting.

Councillor Kelley made a motion that this matter be referred to the Ordinance Committee.

On a voice vote the motion to refer to the Ordinance Committee -
Carried.

#36 Here insert Policy Order # 36 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Cheung stated that this came from the Roundtable. The City Manager suggested having a working group to address areas where there are ambiguities that could be addressed by the City Council.

Councillor Mazen stated that if CDD did the formative work with the working group so that an aggressive look can be taken on zoning to repair any ambiguities he would vote in the affirmative.

36 Adopted by the affirmative vote of nine members.

#37 Here insert Policy Order # 37 read by Mayor Maher. Councillor Mazen supported this. He stated that this was discussed early in his tenure. This is crucial to the City's infrastructure, the ability to bring people in from the outside and show how important open data and functional web projects can be. He made a motion to be added as a co-sponsor on the Policy Order.

Councillor Toomey explained that when he inquired about this program the cost to the City was \$250,000. Is this still the cost and where the funding would come from for this expenditure? Councillor Cheung responded that it is dependent on the City where it is implemented. The City can apply and part of the negotiation is what their fee will be. The fee is based on the size of the City as well.

Councillor Mazen stated that it would be an incredible expenditure. These are people who are in high demand. It is difficult to get the proper applicants when there is a job posting in the IT Department. This is an entry cost to get the City access to the best possible candidates for these jobs. There have been position that have gone unfilled and there is unexpected funds from IT that has gone back into free cash.

Councillor Toomey stated that he would not be voting in favor of this because the expenditure is too great and there are more pressing needs in the City. He does not see the benefit to the City to join this group. He stated that the Personnel Department does a fine job recruiting. He stated that there is no guarantee that the City will receive the best and the brightest candidates. He stated that he did not want an outside agency doing recruiting for the City. He stated that he would not be voting for this.

Councillor Mazen stated that Councillor Toomey's comments made him think about this in the context of the STEAM recommendations. He acknowledge that the funding is large. He explained that he wanted the job postings prepared so that the best candidates are in the applicant pool and have a culture where innovation is prized. This is only one of the tools that the City needs to use to attract the next level of employees.

Councillor McGovern asked if the makers of the motion would be amiable to ask the City Manager to report back as to where the funding would come from and whether this is a good use of funding.

Mayor Maher noted that the City Council is not appropriating the funding for this now. It is a request to the City Manager. It is a request to consider applying.

Councillor Toomey stated that this is not a worthwhile venture. He asked where the funds for the snow removal is coming from. This is an expenditure that needs to be paid. This motion is a luxury.

Councillor Mazen stated his respect for the IT Department but there is a need to set up practices for the next generation.

Councillor Kelley agreed with Councillor Toomey. He stated that if there are problems with hiring IT personnel for the future this is a larger conversation. He stated his concerns with the IT Department in the future and its interaction.

The question now came on the amendment - and on a voice vote the amendment - Carried.

The following order was now considered, the question being on adoption, to wit:
(HERE COPY ORDER # 37)

On this question the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Councillors Carlone, Cheung, Mazen, McGovern and Mayor Maher	- 5
NAYS:	Councillors Kelley, Simmons and Toomey	- 3
ABSENT:	None	- 0
PRESENT:	Vice Mayor Bengan	- 1

and the order was -
Adopted.

LATE RESOLUTIONS

#26-34 All resolutions were made unanimously sponsored and adopted on the affirmative vote of nine members.

LATE POLICY ORDER

Councillor McGovern moved suspension of the rules in order to introduce late Policy Orders.
The question now came on suspension of the rules and the roll was called and resulted as follows:

YEAS:	Vice Mayor Bengan, Councillors Carlone, Mazen, McGovern and Mayor Maher	- 5
NAYS:	Councillors Cheung, Kelley, Simmons and Toomey	- 4
ABSENT:	None	- 0

and the rules were -

Not Suspended.

ADJOURNMENT

On motion of Councillor Toomey the meeting adjourned at 8:42 PM.

A list of document and other exhibits used at the meeting:

***City Manager's Agenda
City Council Agenda
CD of meeting***